



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,830	01/19/2001	Satish Sundar	3492/ALRT/DD/BCVD/JW	9916
32588	7590	09/28/2004	EXAMINER	
APPLIED MATERIALS, INC. 2881 SCOTT BLVD. M/S 2061 SANTA CLARA, CA 95050			UNDERWOOD, DONALD W	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3652		

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/765,830	SUNDAR, SATISH	
	Examiner Donald Underwood	Art Unit 3652	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on the amendment filed 06/11/04.  
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,5-15 and 18-29 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,5-15 and 18-29 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Detailed Action**

1. In claim 24, line 2, "linkage" should be --link--.
2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

It is unclear how a single motor rotates the main robot link and the first extension arm and the first blade. Clarification is required.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

These claims are inaccurate. Applicant's motor m1 rotates the main link and motors m2 and m3 control the first and second extension arms and blades, respectively.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 5-14 and 18-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bacchi '768.

Regarding claims 10 and 23, the remarks set forth in the preceding paragraph are herein repeated.

Regarding claims 24-29, note figure 9.

8. Claims 1, 5-14 and 18-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bacchi '444.

Regarding claims 10 and 23, the 2 to 1 ratio is standard for a straight line movement and Bacchi illustrates straight line movement in figure 3.

Regarding claims 24-29, note figure 10, frame 1 wherein each blade can be moved to a respective aligned position 352L and 352R and an offset position 350.

9. Claims 2 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bacchi '768 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hiruma.

It would have been obvious to use a stepper motor in Bacchi in view of the teaching in Hiruma to provide weight saving.

10. Applicant's amendment and argument have been carefully considered but are not deemed persuasive since independently does not mean only one motor. Note Bacchi '444, column 7, lines 11-24 and Bacchi '768, column 7, lines 45-58, which set forth that each blade can be rotated and extended by operating one motor. Moreover, the claims (1-23) do not preclude separate motors for the arms and blades. They are silent on what moves the arms. They only set forth the structure moving the main link

Art Unit: 3652

and the blades. If applicant persists in seeking patent protection he should consider defining his device by reciting specific structure and not relying on a broad recitation of structure and mode of operation which can be read on structure different than his structure.

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Underwood/vs  
September 20, 2004

*Donald W. Underwood 09/22/04*  
DONALD W. UNDERWOOD  
PRIMARY EXAMINER